

REMARKS

[0010] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-2, 4-6, and 8-33 are currently pending
- Claims 3 and 7 are canceled herein
- No claims are withdrawn or newly added herein
- Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, 13, 18, 20, 22, 26 and 28-30 are amended herein

[0011] Support for the amendments to claims 1, 4-5, 9, 13, 18, 20, 22, 26 and 28-30 is found in the specification at least at paragraphs [0032], [0035], [0037], [0039], [0040]-0041], Fig. 3A and Fig. 3B.

Cited Documents

[0012] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **Stickler: Stickler**, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. **2003/0097365**
- **Darugar: Darugar**, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. **2003/0018661**
- **Ingersoll: Ingersoll, et al.**, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. **2004/0025117**

**Claims 1-33 Are Non-Obvious Over Stickler further in view of Darugar
further in combination with Ingersoll**

[0013] Claims 1-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Stickler further in view of Darugar further in combination with Ingersoll. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Amended Independent Claim 1

[0014] In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 1 is moot. Specifically, the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim (in part, with emphasis added):

“at least one optional data member *described in the XML schema* to render the received data functional within the current version of the data structure when optional data is absent from the received data, *wherein an optional nature of the at least one optional data member is designated in the XML schema*”

“at least one construct *of a first type described in the XML schema* to render the received data functional within the current version of the data structure when the received data includes *an unknown data entity* that is not specified by the current version of the data structure, *wherein a limitation on a number of occurrences of the at least one construct of the first type and a specification of the at least one construct of the first type is defined in the XML schema*”

“*at least one construct of a second type described in the XML schema to render the received data functional within the current version of the data structure when the received data includes an optional data entity that is specified by the current version of the data structure, wherein the at least*

one construct of the second type tolerates an absence of the optional data entity in rendering the received data functional within the current version of the data structure, wherein a limitation on a number of occurrences of the at least one construct of the second type and a specification of the tolerance of the absence of the optional data entity of the at least one construct of the second type is defined in the XML schema"

"receiving data formatted in accordance with the first version and for presenting the received data in an arrangement defined by the data structure for validation by the device using the current version, wherein the received data comprises data received in a Service Oriented Architecture (SOA)"

[0015] The Examiner has not previously considered all of the newly amended features of this claim shown as emphasized above.

[0016] For example, Applicant respectfully asserts that the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest "wherein a limitation on a number of occurrences of the at least one construct of the first type and a specification of the at least one construct of the first type is defined in the XML schema" and "wherein a limitation on a number of occurrences of the at least one construct of the second type and a specification of the tolerance of the absence of the optional data entity of the at least one construct of the second type is defined in the XML schema" as recited in this claim, as amended. In fact, none of these references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest "a **limitation on a number of occurrences** of the ... construct ... defined in the XML schema" as recited in this newly amended claim. Thus, for at least this reason, the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not render this claim obvious.

[0017] Additionally, Applicant further asserts that none of these references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest “a specification of the tolerance of the absence of the optional data entity of the ... construct ... **defined in the XML schema**” as also recited in this newly amended claim. Thus, at least based on this additional reason, the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not render this claim obvious.

[0018] As another example, Applicant asserts that the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest “receiving data formatted in accordance with the first version and for presenting the received data in an arrangement defined by the data structure for validation by the device using the current version, *wherein the received data comprises data received in a Service Oriented Architecture (SOA)*” as recited in this claim, as amended. In fact, none of the cited references teach or suggest the claim feature of “presenting ... data received in a **Service Oriented Architecture (SOA).**”

[0019] Consequently, the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claim 4

[0020] Claim 4 ultimately depends from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claim 4 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency on an allowable base claim. Additionally, this claim may also be allowable for the additional features that it recites.

[0021] For example, Applicant respectfully asserts that the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest “wherein the delimiter and a limitation on a number of occurrences of the delimiter is described in the XML schema” as recited in claim 4, as amended. In fact, none of the references, taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest that a “delimiter and a limitation on a number of occurrences ... is described in the XML schema”. Consequently, the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Amended Independent Claim 5

[0022] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a *prima facie* showing that independent claim 5 is obvious in view of the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll. Applicant submits that the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest at least the following features of this claim, as amended (in part, with emphasis added):

“at least one optional data member to render the received data functional within the current version of the data structure when optional data is absent from the received data, *wherein an optional nature of the at least one optional data member is designated in the XML schema*”

“at least one construct to render the received data functional within the current version of the data structure when the received data includes wildcard data that is not specified by the current version of the data structure, *wherein a limitation on a number of occurrences of the at least one construct is defined in the XML schema*”

“a delimiter which acts as a sentry to validate a beginning of the construct, *wherein the delimiter and a limitation on a number of occurrences of the delimiter is described in the XML schema*”

“at least one wildcard member that follows the delimiter to receive wildcard data received in accordance with a different version of the data structure, *wherein a limitation on a number of occurrences of the wildcard member and a specification of the wildcard member is defined in the XML schema*”

[0023] The Examiner has not previously considered all of the newly amended features of this claim shown as emphasized above.

[0024] For example, Applicant asserts that the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest an “optional data member to render the received data functional within the current version of the data structure when optional data is absent from the received data, wherein an optional nature of the at least one optional data member is designated in the XML schema” as recited in this claim, as amended. However, regarding the claimed “optional data member”, the Examiner cites Stickler, paragraphs [0009] and [0011] (Action, p. 6), shown here for convenience (emphasis added):

[0009] Advantageously, the identification provided by the metadata of the at least one entity corresponds to an indication of an editorial sequence or release comprising those entities within its scope each of which include **metadata defining a position or version with the sequence**. Preferably, where a relationship exists between one or more such editorial sequences, then a further entity indicative of **a different release will contain within its metadata an indication of the source of that release**. Such an indication may identify a particular revision within another release. Thus, the system seeks to overcome a difficult present in known tree-based versioning models namely their inability to explicitly **define relationships between different releases**.

[0011] Such a method may be implemented on any suitable platform with any suitable environment including a network comprising mobile and/or fixed elements. By **defining versioning information within metadata, it permits the generation of a versioning model suited to a particular agent or user request**. Thus, by way of example, a tree-based versioning model may be generated from the metadata albeit with explicit definition of the relationships between releases. It will, of course, be apparent to those skilled in the art that other versioning models may be generated.

[0025] As shown in the passages above, Stickler does not teach or suggest an “optional data member to render the received data functional within the ... data structure **when optional data is absent**” because Stickler describes metadata defining a position or version with the sequence, a source of a release and versioning information. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that none of the cited references, Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll, disclose, teach or suggest the claim features of the “optional data member ... **when optional data is absent**” as recited in this claim.

[0026] As another example, Applicant respectfully asserts that the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest that “an optional nature of the ... optional data member is designated in the XML schema” as recited in this claim, as newly amended. However, regarding “wherein the data structure is described by an XML schema” as recited in dependent claim 7, which has been canceled and incorporated into claim 5, the Examiner relies on Stickler, ¶ [0058] (Action, p. 7), shown here for convenience (with emphasis added):

[0058] In order to allow for referencing of specific content, namely a fragment within a given item, component, instance, or object, MARS 25 adopts the Worldwide Web Consortium (W3C) proposal for the XPointer standard for encoding such content specific references in SGML, HTML, or XML content. A fragment will be understood by those skilled in the art to be an identifiable linear sub-sequence of the data content of a component 37, either static or reproducible, which is normally provided where the full content is either too large

in volume for a particular application or not specifically relevant. Those skilled in the art will also be aware of the W3C Xpointer proposal, however further details may be found from the W3C website which is presently located at www.w3c.org. XPointer is based on the XML Path Language (XPath). **Through the selection of various properties, such as element types, attribute values, character content, and relative position, XPointer supports addressing within internal structures of XML documents and allows for traversals of a document tree. Thus, in place of structural references to data, the framework may provide that explicit element ID values are used for all pointer references thereby avoiding specific references to structural paths and data content.** As a result, a framework according to the present invention ensures the maximal validity of pointer values to all realizations of a given media object, irrespective of language, coverage, encoding, or partitioning. In addition to the Xpointer standard proposal, other alternative/additional internal pointer mechanisms for other encodings may be utilized.

[0027] As shown above, Stickler does not describe “an optional nature of the ... optional data member ... designated in the XML schema” as recited in this claim, as newly amended, because as shown in the passage above, Stickler merely describes “various properties, such as element types, attribute values, character content, and relative position” associated with XPointer addressing. Stickler does not describe “an optional nature of the ... optional data member ... designated in the XML schema” as recited in this claim, as newly amended. Furthermore, the Examiner has not relied on Darugar and Ingersoll for the claim features of the “XML schema”. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest “an optional nature of the ... optional data member ... designated in the XML schema” as recited in this claim, as newly amended.

[0028] Additionally, Applicant further asserts that the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest that “a **limitation on a number of occurrences** of the ... construct ... the delimiter ... [and] the wildcard member ... is defined in the XML schema” as recited in this claim, as amended. None of these

references, alone or in any combination, disclose, teach or suggest the claimed “limitation on a number of occurrences”.

[0029] Consequently, the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claim 9

[0030] Claim 9 ultimately depends from independent claim 5. As discussed above, claim 5 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claim 9 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency on an allowable base claim. Additionally, this claim may also be allowable for the additional features that it recites.

[0031] For example, Applicant asserts that the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest “wherein the end delimiter and a limitation on a number of occurrences of the end delimiter is described in the XML schema” as recited in claim 9, as amended. In fact, none of the references, taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest the claimed “end delimiter and a limitation on a number of occurrences ... described in the XML schema”. Consequently, the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Amended Independent Claim 13

[0032] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a *prima facie* showing that independent claim 13 is obvious in view of the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll. Applicant submits that the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest at least the following features of this claim, as amended (in part, with emphasis added):

“tolerating an absence of optional data from the received data, when the data is received in accordance with a different generation of the type, wherein the optional data comprises a data element known by and deemed optional by the current generation of the type, *wherein an optional nature of the optional data is designated in the XML schema*”

“specifying, in the current generation of the type, a maximum number of times optional data is allowed to appear in the received data, *wherein the maximum number of times optional data is allowed to appear in the received data is specified in the XML schema*”

“specifying, in the current generation of the type, a maximum number of times extra data is allowed to appear in the received data, *wherein the maximum number of times extra data is allowed to appear in the received data is specified in the XML schema*”

[0033] The Examiner has not previously considered all of the newly amended features of this claim shown as emphasized above.

[0034] For example, Applicant asserts that the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest “tolerating an absence of optional data from the received data, when the data is received in accordance with a different generation of the type, wherein the optional data comprises a data element known by and deemed

optional by the current generation of the type, *wherein an optional nature of the optional data is designated in the XML schema*” as recited in this claim, as amended. However, regarding the claimed “tolerating an absence of optional data”, the Examiner cites Stickler, paragraphs [0009] and [0011], shown above in the reasons presented in support of claim 5.

[0035] Without needlessly repeating the reasons presented above in support of claim 5, Applicant respectfully asserts that neither Stickler, nor the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll disclose, teach or suggest the claim feature of “optional data” at least because none of the cited references teach or suggest “tolerating an absence of optional data” as recited in this claim. Furthermore, as addressed in the reasons presented above in support of claim 5, Applicant further asserts that the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not disclose, teach or suggest that “*an optional nature of the optional data is designated in the XML schema*” as recited in this claim, as newly amended, at least because none of the cited references teach or suggest the claim feature of “*an optional nature ... designated in [an] XML schema*”.

[0036] Additionally, Applicant further asserts that the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest that “the maximum number of times optional data [and] ... extra data is allowed to appear in the received data is specified in the XML schema” as recited in this claim, as amended, because none of these references, alone or in any combination, disclose, teach or suggest the claim feature of a “maximum number ... specified in [an] XML schema”. These claim features are missing from Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll as well as their combination.

[0037] Consequently, the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claim 18

[0038] Claim 18 ultimately depends from independent claim 13. As discussed above, claim 13 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claim 18 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency on an allowable base claim. Additionally, this claim may also be allowable for the additional features that it recites.

[0039] For example, Applicant asserts that the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest “wherein the delimiter and a limitation on a number of occurrences of the delimiter is described in the XML schema” as recited in claim 18, as amended. In fact, none of the references, taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest the claim features of the “XML schema”. Consequently, the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Amended Independent Claim 20

[0040] In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 20 is moot. Specifically, the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim (in part, with emphasis added):

“tolerating optional data missing from the received data, when the data is received according to a different type version, *wherein an optional nature of optional data and a limitation on a number of occurrences of optional data is designated in an XML schema*”

“receiving further data included in the received data, when the data is received according to another different type version, *wherein a limitation on a number of occurrences of further data is designated in the XML schema*”

[0041] The Examiner has not previously considered all of the newly amended features of this claim shown as emphasized above.

[0042] For example, Applicant asserts that the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest “tolerating optional data missing from the received data, when the data is received according to a different type version, *wherein an optional nature of optional data and a limitation on a number of occurrences of optional data is designated in an XML schema*” as recited in this claim, as amended. However, regarding the claimed “tolerating optional data missing”, the Examiner cites Stickler, paragraphs [0009] and [0011], shown above in the reasons presented in support of claim 5.

[0043] Without needlessly repeating the reasons presented above in support of claim 5, Applicant respectfully asserts that neither Stickler, nor the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll disclose, teach or suggest the claim features of the “optional data” at least because none of the cited references teach or suggest “tolerating optional data missing from the received data” as recited in this claim. Furthermore, Applicant further asserts that the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not disclose, teach or suggest that “an optional nature of optional data and a limitation on a number of occurrences of optional data is designated in an XML schema” as recited in this claim, as amended, at least because none of the cited references teach or suggest the claim feature of “*an optional nature ... and a limitation on a number of occurrences ... designated in [an] XML schema*”.

[0044] Additionally, Applicant further asserts that the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest that “a limitation on a number of occurrences of further data is designated in the XML schema” as recited in this claim, as amended, because none of these references, alone or in any combination, disclose, teach or suggest the claimed “limitation on a number of occurrences ... in [an] XML schema”.

[0045] Consequently, the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claim 26

[0046] Claim 26 ultimately depends from independent claim 20. As discussed above, claim 20 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claim 26 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency on an

allowable base claim. Additionally, this claim may also be allowable for the additional features that it recites.

[0047] For example, Applicant asserts that the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest “wherein the delimiter and the end delimiter and a limitation on a number of occurrences of the delimiter and the end delimiter are described in the XML schema” as recited in claim 26, as amended. In fact, none of the references, taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest the claim features of the “limitation on a number of occurrences ... in [an] XML schema”. Consequently, the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Amended Independent Claim 28

[0048] In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 28 is moot. Specifically, the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim (in part, with emphasis added):

“means for excusing optional data being absent from the received data, when the data is received according to a different generation of the type, *wherein an optional nature of optional data and a limitation on a number of occurrences of optional data is designated in an XML schema*”

“means for receiving further data in the received data, when the data is received according to another different generation of the type, *wherein a limitation on a number of occurrences of further data is designated in the XML schema*”

[0049] The Examiner has not previously considered all of the newly amended features of this claim shown as emphasized above.

[0050] For example, Applicant asserts that the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest “excusing optional data being absent from the received data, when the data is received according to a different generation of the type, *wherein an optional nature of optional data and a limitation on a number of occurrences of optional data is designated in an XML schema*” as recited in this claim, as amended. However, regarding the claimed “excusing optional data being absent”, the Examiner cites Stickler, paragraphs [0009] and [0011], shown above in the reasons presented in support of claim 5.

[0051] Without needlessly repeating the reasons presented above in support of claim 5, Applicant respectfully asserts that neither Stickler, nor the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll disclose, teach or suggest the claim features of the “optional data” at least because none of the cited references teach or suggest “excusing optional data being absent from the received data” as recited in this claim. Furthermore, Applicant further asserts that the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not disclose, teach or suggest that “*an optional nature of optional data and a limitation on a number of occurrences of optional data is designated in an XML schema*” as recited in this claim, as amended, at least because none of the cited references teach or suggest the claim feature of “*an optional nature ... and a limitation on a number of occurrences ... designated in [an] XML schema.*”

[0052] Additionally, Applicant further asserts that the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest that “a limitation on a number of occurrences of

further data is designated in the XML schema” as recited in this claim, as amended, because none of these references, alone or in any combination, disclose, teach or suggest the claim features of the “limitation on a number of occurrences” as recited in this newly amended claim.

[0053] Consequently, the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claim 30

[0054] Claim 30 ultimately depends from independent claim 28. As discussed above, claim 28 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claim 30 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency on an allowable base claim. Additionally, this claim may also be allowable for the additional features that it recites.

[0055] For example, Applicant asserts that the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest “wherein the delimiter and a limitation on a number of occurrences of the delimiter is described in the XML schema” as recited in claim 30, as amended. In fact, none of the references, taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest the claim features of the “XML schema”. Consequently, the combination of Stickler, Darugar and Ingersoll does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims

[0056] If not already addressed individually above, in addition to its own merits, each dependent claim is allowable for at least the same reasons that its base claim is allowable. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of each dependent claim where its base claim is allowable.

Conclusion

[0057] Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/ E. John Fain / _____

Dated: 5/20/09

E. John Fain(johnf@leehayes.com; 509-944-4756)
Registration No. 60960

Reviewer:
Jacob S. Scott (Jake@leehayes.com; x4728)
Registration No. 62806

Assistant: Megan Arnold (megan@leehayes.com; x4770)
Customer No. **22801**

Facsimile: (509) 323-8979
www.leehayes.com